1 2 3 4 5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 8 9 Robert Montgomery Chastain, No. CV-13-00500-NVW (DKD) 10 Petitioner, **ORDER** 11 v. and **DENIAL OF CERTIFICATE OF** 12 Charles L. Ryan, et al., APPEALABILITY AND IN FORMA **PAUPERIS STATUS** 13 Respondents. 14 15 16 Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") of 17 Magistrate Judge Duncan (Doc. 13) regarding Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas 18 Corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. 1). The R&R recommends that the 19 Petition be denied and dismissed with prejudice. The Magistrate Judge advised the 20 parties that they had fourteen days to file objections to the R&R. (R&R at 5 [citing 21 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)].) No objections were filed. 22 Because the parties did not file objections, the Court need not review any of the 23 Magistrate Judge's determinations on dispositive matters. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); 24 Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003); 25 Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) ("[Section 636(b)(1)] does not . . . require any

review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection."). The absence of a

timely objection also means that error may not be assigned on appeal to any defect in the

rulings of the Magistrate Judge on any non-dispositive matters. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) ("A

26

27

28

Case 2:13-cv-00500-NVW Document 21 Filed 02/26/14 Page 2 of 2